

READ

Political Parties
during the
Long Parliament

History

A. B.

1901

Learning and Labor.

LIBRARY

OF THE

University of Illinois.

CLASS.	BOOK.	VOLUME.
1901	R22	

Accession No.



Origin
and growth of political parties
during the Long Parliament

by

Nellie Lewis Read

Thesis

For the Degree of A. B.

In the College
of
Literature and Arts

University of Illinois

Presented
June - 1901.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2013

<http://archive.org/details/oringrowthofpo00read>

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS

Urbana, May 21 1901

THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT THE THESIS PREPARED UNDER MY SUPERVISION BY

Nellie Lewis Read

ENTITLED

Origin and Growth of Political
Parties during the Long Parliament

IS APPROVED BY ME AS FULFILLING THIS PART OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF

Bachelor of Arts.

Evarts B. Greene

HEAD OF DEPARTMENT OF

History.

The origin of political parties in England is usually traced to ecclesiastical differences found in the Long Parliament. In order, however, to understand and appreciate the further development of these parties it is necessary to go back farther than 1641. As the coalescing of the parties was due to ecclesiastical discussions, it is in the history of the church, that we must look to find the first shadows of the future division.

During the reign of Henry VIII and especially after the separation from Rome, the balance between the various parties, was maintained by the King's firm will and his powerful personality. Although England was now a Protestant country, still the larger portion were Catholics, the change that had taken place being merely a legal and political one. During

Edward and Mary's reign Protestantism grew slowly and continued to do so during Elizabeth's reign. The latter was driven by force of circumstances and necessity, to become a champion and believer of Protestantism. As she was the daughter of Anne Boleyn it was impossible for her to have friendly relations with Rome. Soon after she ascended the throne she issued the second Prayer Book of Edward VI, which was declared to be the only form of prayer to be used in churches. "Whosoever," it was declared, "was to be practically free;" but all must go to church and the exercise of the Roman Catholic religion was suppressed.^x

The queen did not intend to be severe to the Catholics. She was uninterested in theological discussions and failed to see that they were vital questions to the majority of her subjects. The desire for toleration in England

^x Englebert, S.R.
History of England, vol. 1, p. 12

that had been growing hot ground
when the conspiracy of the Pope, Philip
of Spain and Mary, Queen of Scots
became known. As soon as the prime
movers of the opposition had been so
rigidly punished, it was natural
that the many who supported the
movement should suffer severely.
The lines that separated Catholics
from Protestants were drawn more
sharply. Acts were passed against
priests who should attempt to reconcile
any subject of the Queen to the See of
Rome, or should even be found engaged
in the celebration of the mass. Church
members were frequently fined and
imprisoned. These years were increasing

*Prothero, R. T.

Statutes and constitutional documents 159-1623

23 Eliz. c. 1. To retain the Queen's subjects in obedience.

c. 2. Against seditious words and rumors.

27 Eliz. c. 1. For the security of the Queen's person.

35 Eliz. c. 1. To retain the Queen's subjects in obedience.

c. 2. Against Popish Recusants.

the distance between the two. The old generation who had been born into the Catholic Church was passing away. In addition the question was becoming a national one. The Catholics, backed by the Pope and Philip, would have made a radical change in the government of England.

But while the Catholics and Protestants are growing farther apart, there is a further division within the Protestant party. Calvinism as a theory of right living had gained much ground in England. When it came to a question of church government, however, there was difficulty. The conservatism of the English nation was shown plainly in this matter. The majority still clung to the old forms and ceremonies, while a small minority, or "non-conformists" as they were called, pleaded for liberty in belief and actions.

The spirit of the two parties and Elizabeth's attitude is shown in the Vestarian controversy. In deciding against the Non-conformists as Elizabeth did, she was really following the spirit of the English constitution and the will of the people. The two great changes produced

By the Reformation in England, were the doctrine of the royal supremacy and the power of lay courts over ecclesiastical.^{*}

To introduce Presbyterianism meant to set up another power in England that could not from its nature acknowledge itself as an inferior one. As might have been expected the result of the Queen's action was not peace but war. The war was carried on by discussions and pamphlets in which Whitgift and Cartwright were prominent. The latter stood for freedom from forms and and the former was the forerunner of the extreme High Church party.

In 1571 the House of Commons enters the discussion. Bill had been brought in to amend the Prayer Book, and during this discussion a bill was passed to which "all ministers were compelled to those articles only which concerned the Christian faith and doctrine of the Sacraments."⁸ The House evidently intended that the subscribers should be freed

⁸ Makower, p. 69

^{*} Gardiner Vol. I, p. 18

^o 13 Eliz. c. 1. An act against the bringing in and putting in execution of Bulls, Provisions, &c.

rom. binding themselves in matters relating to discipline. This is the first breach between the Commons and the Crown and it is significant of what is to follow. ^x

The Queen increased the difficulty by appointing Whitgift as Arch. Bishop. He was like Laud, in desiring uniformity, and the exalting of the English church. He was a well meaning and honest man but narrow and tactless.

At the beginning of James reign we find the people in England divided into four parties, using the term in a very broad sense; namely, (1) Catholics, (2) High Church, (3) Puritans (4) Non-conformists. In speaking of the latter ^{two} Gardiner makes the general division that the former desired reform in the church while the latter were willing to form an independent church.

When James came to the throne the conflict broke out anew. He had been brought up as a Protestant, but had a strong bias towards Episcopacy. The Puritans lost no time in sending in a petition in

^x Gardiner, Vol. 1, p. 93

favor of certain reforms in the Prayer Book and administration of the church. * The result of this was the Hampton Court conference (1604)^o, between Puritans and representatives of the state church. It brought the two parties no nearer to each other. The changes that were made were immaterial and did not concern individual liberty or freedom of worship.

The Canons of 1604 followed, with James' mildness towards the Catholics, increased severity towards more advanced Protestants⁸ caused opposition to spring up in Parliament. The chief man of the opposition was Chief Justice Coke and in his legal decisions there are many references to the church and state and their relations to each other.

James' efforts to establish Episcopacy in Scotland, his attack on the heritable jurisdiction at the opening of Parliament in 1617, the proposed act on ecclesiastical affairs and Pym's speech at this

* Prothero p. 413

Millenary petition

^o - Hampton court conference (p. 416)

⁸ Makower, p. 71

Parliament shows the growing opposition between the Puritans on the one hand and the school of Andrews and Laud on the other.

A few years back the conflict had been between the Pope and King of Spain and English Protestants.^x Now it was altogether different. The Catholics were no longer to be feared and although there were still many who yet dreaded Rome and thought her converts meant advanced power in England, yet unconsciously they had changed their attitude. Now they were fighting sin and immorality. It was a barrier set up against the thoughtless and frivolous spirit of the age as seen in Buckingham, Lady Roce, Falkland and expressed in "The declaration of sports" and Selden's "History of Tithe". Both sides were undoubtedly narrow. The puritan with his lofty ideal, would do away with much that was good and beautiful because it was connected with what seemed to him wrong. He advocated radical measures, the tearing

^x Gardiner Vol. 4. p. 240.

up of the evil by the roots, while the believers in Episcopacy advanced a more conservative policy. Man should be surrounded by various external forms and ceremonies that would soften the heart and nature and gradually through this change in his environment he would make a change in his habits.^{*} Both sides were in danger refusing political power to carry out their ends. The High Church party was fortunate in having such men as Laud and Andrewes to carry out their ideas. As in the Puritan party a two fold tendency was visible here. Andrewes was a mystic and ascetic; Laud a disciplinarian. The one would attract, the other compel men to follow his example.

In the accession of Charles I the nature of the contest changed again. Under James it had been a civil contest, under Charles it became both civil and ecclesiastical. In the first Parliament of Charles I the keynote of what was to follow was struck by Eliot.

"Religion it is," he says, "that keeps the subjects in obedience, as being taught

^{*}Gardiner Vol. 4 p 244

by God to Honor His viceroyants. A religando
it is called, as the common obligation among
men - the tie of all friendship and society -
the bond of all office and relation. For where
there is division in religion, so it makes
distruction among men. For the unity - I
wish posterity might say we had preserved
for them that which was left to us." ^x

Soon after this speech Pym draws
up a petition to take measures against the
spread of the Roman Catholic church, which
was passed.

Two books appeared during these
years that aroused intense opposition.
One "Gron's plea against the Prelacie"
was written by Alexander Leighton. It was
a bitter attack on prelacy and "an appeal
to political presbyterianism to take the
sword in hand." It was a Puritan of
the narrowest type. Montague's "New Lay for an
Old Goose" inopportunately came at this time. ⁸

^x Gardiner, Vol. V p 343

^o Gardiner Vol. VII p 144

National Dictionary Biography (Leighton)

⁸ Gardiner Vol. VI p 352

This book is an exposition of the reasons that were leading men to reject both the doctrines of Rome and Geneva. He objected to the Calvinistic (Puritan) belief in predestination. On the other hand he would not say that the "Roman Catholic church was Anti-Christ and the Pope a man of sin." Those who remained in the church were of the Church of Christ, corrupt and unsound in the highest degree, it was true "but not wholly apostate." In short he was a broad minded critic of the two religious systems and saw plainly the tendency and longing of the Englishman for certain forms, similar to what they had been accustomed to in former times. When this book was finally referred to the Committee in the House, there was but one result. The members of the Commons were conservative lawyers, and country gentlemen and Calvinists, and were naturally opposed to Montague, who represented a reaction against their stern beliefs. Montague, in this respect, stands for Episcopacy or the High Church party, which was but a swing of the pendulum away from a religion that was a life of

little to a religion of peace and quiet.
This movement originated in the Universities
and was consequently not a popular one;
its followers were the literati, the men of
culture and education. For this reason and
because they opposed to great world forces,
Rome and Calvinism - not casting off
entirely either, they stood in an uncertain
position and with few followers. In the
struggle that soon followed this High
Church party united with the King and
the Puritans or Calvinists with Parliament. The
Court of the High Commission was used
by the former to advance their powers.
Many of the persecuted sought refuge in
America. The Metropolitan visitations, by
which Laud hoped to carry out his policy of
"Thorough", his disregard of English conservatism
and customs, produced as general irritation.
Laud's endeavors towards enforced unity only
increased the bitter feeling of the Calvinists
which were bitter enough already.

In Scotland (1633) Charles issued a
book of canons, which recognized royal

x Gardiner, Vol. VII, p. 106

supremacy in church and state, and in 1636
a new liturgy based on English book of
Common Prayer. The result was a popular
outbreak and ultimately a civil war. To
obtain a grant of money the King called a
Parliament April 13, 1641.^{*} This new Parliament
was opened by a speech from the Lord
Keeper, Finch, who set forth at length
the troubles in Scotland and the
immediate need of money. As soon as this
was granted - he said the grievances might
be brought up. To strengthen Charles position
an intercepted letter addressed to "Le Roi,"
supposedly to the French King from conspirators,
was read. Greville records the sen-
timents of all when he says that "had
as a Scottish invasion might be, the
invasion made upon the liberties of the
subjects at home were nearer and more
dangerous." Not only ought these grievances
to be removed, but an example ought
to be made of the men with whom they
had originated; "by now followed ma

^{*} Gardiner Vol. IX, p. 100

^o Rushworth Vol. III p. 1125

speech more specifically directed against ecclesiastical grievances. The next day Pym in a long, logical address summed up the grievances under three heads.*

1. Privileges of Parliament.

The following words best express his idea and also give the political side of the coming revolution. — "The powers of Parliament are to the body politic as the rational faculties of the soul to man."

2. Ecclesiastical grievances.

His chief point here was, that the present system was compulsory — personal liberty was disregarded.

3. Civil grievances.

Under this head he included the long list of political troubles; enforcement of tonnage and poundage; impositions without Parliamentary grant; monopolies, enlargement of forests, etc.

His remedy was to ask the Lords join in "searching out the causes and remedies of these insupportable grievances" and in petitioning the King for redress.

* Rushworth Vol. II, p. 21

This speech determined the course of
proceedings in the House,* and the next few
days they busied themselves with three questions.
In the first they were called to White Hall
and the immediate necessity of voting sub-
sidies was urged by the King. The next
day the Commons went into a committee
on the message and resolved to demand a
conference with the Lords. Till the liberties
of the House and Kingdom were cleared,
they knew not whether they had anything
to give or no". This angered the King
and he appealed to the Lords who
supported him in his request for subsidies.
The Commons considered this as a
breach of Privileges. Their determination
not to grant the subsidies until the
matter of arbitrary taxation at least was
decided, impelled Charles to dissolve the
Parliament on May 3rd.

The convocation of the southern
and northern provinces had, accord-
ing to custom, been summoned simultane-
ously with Parliament. Contrary to

* Gardiner Vol. II, p. 156

custom, but upon strength of royal permission, they continued in convocation and voted a series of canons in which the divine right of kings was recognized, armed resistance to him under all circumstances condemned; and bound themselves by oath, "never to alter the government of this church by archbishops, bishops, deans, and archdeacons, as it now stands established".^x These canons immediately aroused opposition.

In August the Scotch marched into England acting in concert with part of English opposition. The King could not depend upon his army, funds could not be raised, and Charles was compelled to summon that historic parliament of which it has been said — "Many thought it would never have a beginning and afterwards it would never have an end."^o It at once began an attack on the government and on persons in whom the King had trusted.

^x Smith p. 399

^o Ibid

The feeling in the House was, that everything had gone wrong - the High church men and Puritan on the future Carabai and Roundhead, were of one mind on this matter. At this time there was no thought of opposition to the King. His name is not mentioned in the Debates. They gave him credit, however, for a much more resolute and consistent policy than he was capable of. They held that all that had taken place was the result of a certain definite policy; to replace law and liberty by despotism; and this political despotism in turn to be subjected to an ecclesiastical despotism of the Pope.^{*}

Parliament's strength lay first of all in popular support; second in the armies. Charles stood in an altogether different relation with this parliament than any previous one. His former dissolutions meant disordered finances; this meant absolute ruin.^{xx}

^{*} Gardiner Vol. II, p. 219

^{xx} Ibid

In the House there was but one mind, and that mind was conservative. All were united in despising innovations and determined to suppress them. (You did not take the leading place that he afterwards assumed, but even in the early debates the strong and powerful personality of the man comes out plainly. His speeches show a thoughtful, practical, conservative statesman; one who has much respect and reverence for the traditions of the English nation and a desire to attain his ends by constitutional means.

In the long list of grievances^x that were presented in November and the speeches during the debates of that month and of December, there is unity along all lines but one - and that is religious matters. These months are marked by the growing hostility against the King's counsellors, that culminated in arrest, impeachment and trial of Strafford and Laud. These, together with the dislike of the Catholics,

^x Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 21

Journals p. 21

Hardwin Vol. IV, p. 224

intensified by the Queen and supposed plots^x,
revelation of Star Chamber victims, - found
their outlet and expression in the London
petition against episcopacy, debates on
new canons and in the resolution of the
House to do away with Laudian inno-
vations.

The first debates wandered as there was
no party organization, no leader to mark
out a definite line of policy. Of the questions
discussed, the impeachment of Strafford,
ship money, defensive measures against
the Catholics, the debates show no division.

Take the question of ship money
for instance. It comes up in the early
part of the session as one of the grievances.
The most influential speech made on this
subject was by Falkland.^{xx} Although again

^x

For correspondence of plots see Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 1316

^o Rushworth Vol. IV p. 100-111

Journals p. 47

^{xx}

Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 87-88

Journals p. 46

and again he differs with Pym on church
questions they are one, together with the House.
So strong was the feeling that on Dec. 7 a
bill was passed declaring "all raising of Money,
commonly called Ship Money, is against the
Laws of the Realm, the Subjects right of
Property and contrary to former Resolutions
in Parliament and to the Petition of Rights"
This passed "Nemine Contradicente" "In order
for the Lords to vacate the Records about
Ship money and repay the Sheriff the
Ship money in their hands" same latter.^x

There was no Royalist party, that is
none who wished to defend the crown policy.
If division was to come it is evident
it must come from another quarter.
Men it is true might not agree about
the details of the future political institutions
but they were agreed as to its general char-
acteristics, namely - the reign of law and
authority of Parliament.

The first difference is found in the
decision of the committee of the London petition.

^x Journals 47

Rushworth Vol. IV, 195

This petition^x demanded church reform and the abolition of Episcopacy and was signed by 13,000 Londoners. On the question of its commitment to a committee there were "many against and many for the same."⁵ This division is noteworthy as significant of what is to follow.

On December the 16th. the Canons passed during the summer were abolished. At this time the King's negotiations for foreign aid, his action respecting Goodman's case, Irish and Scotch difficulties, and the tampering of the Queen with leaders of Parliament, hastened matters.

Concerning the strength of the feeling of opposition a phrase in the London petition is noteworthy. The extermination of Episcopacy was demanded "root and branch".^{xx} There was a movement against the Bishops and the Prayer Book also; disturbances in London churches by people who were determined to do away with the new innovations by force. On the

^x Journals p. 233

Rushworth Vol. IV, p. 93

⁵ Gardiner Vol. IX, p. 247

^{xx} Rushworth Vol. IV p. 93

other side. a body of Separatists had been taken into custody.

It was evident that the church question had to be solved in one way or another. There was a large number who determined if bishops continued to exist they must be brought under subjection of Parliament, their laws and their authority curtailed. There was a large number of theonists who argued that Episcopacy was anti-Christian; a smaller number who believed it was a divine institution. To the mass of the people it made little difference. They cared more how worship was conducted, than how clergy were governed. Laud had roused the dislike against the forms of the church into new life. The majority simply wanted the reforms he introduced. Abandoned the bowing at the name of Jesus, removal of communion table to east end, compulsory abstinence of work on Saints days, etc. There were thousands to whom the words of the Prayer Book were dear. To these Bishop Hall addressed his "Humble Remonstrance for Liturgy and Episcopacy" which appeared in January. The title itself is significant of the times. The

question of the liturgy / the church being of vital importance and taking precedence over Episcopacy.* His main point was that the Book of Common Prayer could be adapted to every mood of Christian devotion. Some few things needed redress, but the old form and system should remain.

It is not at all strange that Charles liked the book or that those who wished to see Presbyterianism established in England held it as a most poor piece.

Presbyterianism as well as Episcopacy had many enemies in England. This is especially true in the House. Of these Hyde, Molyneux and Falkland were prominent.

On February the 8th. those momentous debates opened in the House.^o The question at issue was, whether the Londoners petition should be committed together with the ministers petition which asked that the Bishops might be restrained by certain definite rules.

* Gardiner Vol. IX p. 275

^o Burnet's History III, p. 170-188

The first speech was given by Rudyard^v. He argued that the church had too much power. It would soon surpass that of the state and cites the example of the Roman Empire and the Popes. The Church, he declared, should be restrained in its larger powers, such as excommunication, etc. Some of the ministry should be joined to them to regulate matters.

Mr. Digby^o followed with a speech that shows his friendly feeling towards the Court and his lack of sympathy with the middle and lower classes. The London petition should only be used as "an index of grievances", and calls it a comet with the tail pointing towards the north. Parliament might regulate and make laws but it was presumptuous for those outside to petition against a law in force. After assailing the petitioners he turns and criticises the Bishops, declaring that he is willing to cry with the Londoners "down with them" but surely

^x Vol. IV, p. 183

^o Vol. IV p. 171

there is some good in an institution that has existed so long, and he thinks a triennial Parliament will solve the difficulty of keeping it in order. As for Presbyterianism or limited Episcopacy, he says it can not exist with a monarchy. They would be sure to claim the right of excommunicating the King.

Falkland in the next speech dwelt more upon the intellectual side of the question. A presbyter to him was but a new name for the old priest. Through Laud, freedom of speech, consequently in a measure freedom of thought had been suppressed. The church was becoming an English Catholic church. In spite of this gloomy outlook, Falkland would not do away with Episcopacy. He would repeal the persecuting laws; go back to the time of Saint Paul and trust to the triennial Parliament.

Picannes replied to Sligo rather than to the idealistic theories of Falkland. He takes up the right of the people to petition

* Vol. IV, p. 184

and declares that the House of Commons is responsible to its constituents and can not act alone. He saw plainly that an ecclesiastical government was not in accordance with the best interests of a Parliamentary government. "Until the ecclesiastical government be framed something of another twist, and be more assimilated to that of the commonwealth, I fear the ecclesiastical will be no good neighbor unto the civil, but will still be casting of its leaven into it, to reduce that also to a sole substance and arbitrary way of proceeding." "A second and greater evil" he adds, "and of dangerous consequence in the sole and arbitrary power of Bishops over the clergy is this — That they have by that means a power to place and displace the whole clergy of their diocese at their pleasure and this is such a power that for my part I had rather they had the like power over the estates and persons of all within their diocese; for if I held the one but at the will and pleasure of one man, I can have but little or at least no certain joy or comfort in the other." He then goes

on to speak of the real danger, it consisting in the power of the clergy to mould the people as they willed through their influence in the pulpit.

Mr Bagshaw and Plydell followed^x arguing that Episcopacy was not inseparable from the crown. Mr. Gunnington came next arguing that it was not necessary to do away with episcopacy to reform it. Temporal jurisdiction should be taken away, and the High Commission court abolished. Pym, Hampden, St John and Holles were all for the committal of petition. Lyde, Culpepper, Selden, and Hopton followed Sligby and Falkland.

Although the difference of the stand-points taken on this day is slight, yet it marks the separating of the two parties. The previous unity of the house is shown in the debates. Both sides are agreed in desiring restrictions on the monarchy as shown in remarks on triennial bill. In purely church matters they were still united on many points. They wanted

the church to be under restrictions imposed by Parliament; the bishops ought not to have their old un-restrained power, nor did either party think of the bishops as having divine origin. The difference lay in the question as to where the strongest influence and "coercive jurisdiction" should rest.^x The man in the pulpit with freedom to speak and power to enforce his words would mould the thoughts and lives of men. The Puritans would have the minister teach and conduct the religious worship and leave to the church as a body all "coercive jurisdiction." On the other hand the High Church party would place "coercive jurisdiction" in the hands of the Bishops.

The present need was as Fennius said to give the institutions another twist, to bring them into some tolerable harmony with the religious feelings of a greater part of the nation, and also to make the system broad enough to permit one to think and believe as he saw fit. There was no one, however, to see this, or strong enough to carry out such a measure, nor was the nation

^x Gardiner Vol. IX p. 252

ready for it. There is one point that it is necessary to emphasize, namely that the former bishops had been nominated by the King and no mention was made by the defenders of Episcopacy of any change. This transfers the question from purely a church to a political matter.

In the days that followed the breach between them widened; Hyde, Culpeper and Falkland came forward as champions of the Royal prerogative and decided opponents to a Scottish alliance. Whether this breach could be healed or not depended upon the attitude Penn and his party took towards the Root and Branch party and this attitude depended upon the confidence they would be able to feel in the King, and the reception with which the Bishops' exclusion bill would meet in the House of Lords.

Charles continued to show himself unstable and unworthy of trust. ^x He attempted to win the leaders of Parliament by favors, he was constantly trying to play one party against another. To him the

^x Gardiner Vol. IX, p. 378

House of Commons was a body of
murders who had robbed him of his best
and most trusted counsellor. They were rebels
and with rebels he need not keep his word.

The Commons by the act prohibiting the
dissolution of the present Parliament had cut
themselves away from the crown. Pym stood
on uncertain ground. He did not know
whom to trust and advance without revo-
lutionary or unconstitutional measures seemed
impossible.

On the 21st. The Bishops exclusion bill
went into committee in the Upper House^x. By the
27th the Peers had agreed to exclude clergymen
as a rule, from all civil functions. The bishops,
however, were to be excepted, so far as
related to their seats in Parliament. The general
feeling against seeing clergymen employed
in temporal affairs was modified by the
strong conservative feeling to resist any
change in the constitution of the Upper House.
This vote was a defiance to the majority
in the House of Commons. If that
majority, a part, how large it is impossible to

^x Gardiner Vol. IX p. 378

determine, desired absolute abolishment of Episcopacy. This "Root-and-Branch" party had been strengthened lately by the discovery that 400,000 £ were yet needed to pay off the army. As the higher clergy were regarded as instigators of the war, there was a strong feeling that they should be compelled to bear the burden and their estates confiscated if necessary. The defenders of Episcopacy were also a minority in the House, and the balance rested, as mentioned before, with Pym and his followers. They were determined to place the King under constitutional restraint and establish Protestant worship in the churches. They felt that the Bishops were merely mouthpieces of the King and for him to have twenty six votes at his disposal was dangerous.^x The day on which the decision of the Lords became known, Vane and Cromwell brought with them into the House a bill, said to have been drawn up by St. John, the object of which was the absolute extinction of episcopacy. This was proposed by Fleming, passed to second reading

^x Gardiner Vol. IX, p. 387

by a majority of 135 to 108. On June 4th. there was a conference on the earlier bill, but on the 8th. it was thrown out on the third reading. There might be differences of opinion on the subject of church government, but there were none on limiting the prerogative. On the same day three bills were brought in and read a third time without division - They concerned the illegality of ship money, limiting extent of forests and abolishing of knight-hood fines.

It was on this same day that after Parnes produced the report of the committee on the army plot, occurred that tumultuous scene in the House and the long exciting debate. This revealed plainly that the government of Charles and a reformed government were incompatible.

Pym in his ten propositions makes a great effort to unite the warring parties and partially succeeded it being accepted by both Houses.^x The main proposals were: The disbandment of the armies, delay of King's journey, and removal of evil counsellors.

^x Gardiner Vol. IV, p. 401

This cut Charles away from his supporters. He did not see his danger any clearer, but insisted on following his own plans and going to Scotland.

The ~~root-and-branch~~ bill^x was dropped then in Parliament. It was not the time for divisions. The armies must be disbanded as soon as possible. So there was no government in England, Parliament issued ordinances. Practically the House had already taken executive control, but not so openly. On the 28th of August it was voted to adjourn on the 8th of September, not to meet again until the 20th of October. This is the last time the two parties cooperated with each other and it marks the beginning of the strife.

The root of the difficulty lay in the proposed ecclesiastical legislation. It was not natural that these matters should rest. To the great mass of the people - religious questions were their chief intellectual food; religious books were their only literature. There were many whose constitutional

^x Gardiner Vol. X, p. 1

arguments did not touch, but were vitally quickened if a religious question was mooted. Laud, Williams and Milton, the most prominent literary men, were occupied with these subjects. The old belief that religious freedom meant anarchy still existed. Laud's unwise attempts had simply recoiled on himself. More extreme Puritans thought attack on Prayer Book and bishops holy work. It was becoming a class question also. The church was becoming anarchical, guided by the will of the strongest at that moment. Some uniform law was needed. A strong hand was necessary, and Parliament was the only one. But this body could not do worthy work. It represented the extremes of both sides, and it mistook the voice of the majority for voice of the nation and neglected the small but very important minority.

The announcement for adjournment was followed by a feeling of regret in not doing anything on the religious question. They determined to do away with Laudian innovations; to remove the communion table from

^x Gardiner Vol. X, p. 13

the east end of the church and have the
rails taken down, that all crucifixes,
scandalous pictures of one or more persons of
the Trinity and all images of the "Virgin
Mary" should be "taken away" and "all
tapers and candlesticks and basins be
removed from the communion table; that all
corporal bowing at the name of Jesus, or
towards the east end of the church or towards
the communion table be henceforth forborne;
that all dancing and sports be forborne on
the Lord's day, and the preaching of sermons
be permitted in the afternoon." ^{xx}

If they had stopped here there
would not have been many difficulties
raised, but in the proposal to alter the
Prayer Book, intense opposition was aroused. ^{xx}

There is now a possibility for Charles
to find a party not only in Parliament
but also in the nation. The Lords'
proposed amendments only make
an antagonism between the Houses.

In Scotland Charles at first

^x Journals p. 279

^{xx} Gardiner Vol. X, p. 15-

appears to be successful, but funds and his usual double policy soon disband all friendly feeling and when the "Incident" becomes known he is more mistrusted than ever. When Parliament reassembles the "shadow of the incident" is there hovering and preventing a compromise.

The days between the adjournment and assembly of Parliament were marked by a growth of fanaticism and headlong religious zeal that produced a rising feeling against the religious sects.^x Even in October however, after the Incident has become known in England, the party has not yet formed the two parties. Gardiner declares that even at this time if there had been no question but the political one there would have been no division. The history of the next month is disappointing. There was no man broad enough to see that the only solution was in compromise and toleration. It is disappointing to find

^x Gardiner Vol. X, p. 31

Pym so narrow and yet his very narrowness made him the leader of men that he was. Falkland who spoke in February against Laudian innovations was now equally offended by the rigour of the Presbyterians. Still there were a few voices raised for toleration, Burton in a pamphlet, entitled the "Protestation Protested" and Lord Brooks' "Discourse on Episcopacy" have the broader vision. The keen insight of these men had little influence.

Events followed each other in rapid succession, hastening the end. The Irish rebellion, Grand Remonstrance, Charles return and attempt on five members, struggle for militia, in the midst of which the Episcopal party becomes the Royalists party. The immediate cause of this was a motion by Pym^x that "His Majesty should employ only such counsellors and ministers as should be approved by Parliament," "If herein," the Commons further said, "His Majesty shall not vouch-safe

^x Journals p. 301

to condescend to our humble supplication,
although we shall always continue with
reverence and faithfulness to his person and
to the Crown, to perform those duties of
service and obedience to which by the laws
of God and this Kingdom we are obliged,
yet we should be forced, in discharge of
the trust which we owe to the State, and
to those whom we represent, to resolve
upon some way of defending Ireland from
the rebels, as may concur to the securing
of ourselves from such mischievous
counsels and designs as we have lately
been and still are in practise and
agitation against us, as we have just
cause to believe; and to commend those aids
and contributions which this great
necessity shall require, to the custody
and disposing of such persons of honour
and fidelity as we have the cause to
confide in."*

Thus modified Pym's instructions
were startling. It is the most
distinctly revolutionary proposal that

* Gardiner Vol. X, p. 57

has been adopted by the Commons. This took the executive power in so far as Ireland was concerned. Cromwell moves to entrust Essex with power over trained bands and "this power might continue till this Parliament shall take further orders."^x This was an open attack on the prerogative of the King.

It is not necessary to decide whether Pym's motion was justifiable or not. The result was the conversion of the Episcopalian party into a Royalists. That party was a minority in the Commons but held the majority in the House of Lords. To baffle the Puritans was now its chief object. To attain this end they were willing to trust the King and take the chances of an Irish campaign. On religious grounds there could be no compromise. The Commons, fearing to stand alone, turned to the people and appealed to them through the Grand Remonstrance^{xx}. This was more

^x Journals p. 305-

^{xx} Gardiner, S. R.
Const. Hist. p. 127.

than a political document. It was a
gage of battle to the High Church party
or the Royalists. It was a declaration
of religious rights. In that, they took
a stand for which they afterwards
fought and died.

Bibliography.

The following general histories were consulted, to obtain a comprehensive view of the ground covered. The works on the constitutional phase of the question and the Church histories being used for special points. A careful study was made of the sources on the period covered by the Long Parliament. The chief authority followed, however, was Gardiner.

General Works.

Gardiner, S. R.

History of England. 1603-1642
10 vol.

Green, John Richard

History of the English people. Vol. II
Puritan England 1603-'60
The revolution 1660-'88

Pank, Leopold von.

A history of England principally
in the 17th. century.

Smith, G. Barnett.

History of the English Parliament.

Trail, H. D.

Social England.

English Constitution

Bagehot, Walter

The English constitution and other
political essays.

Ames, Dr. Randolph.

History of the English constitution
Tr. by Philip S. Ashworth. 2 vol.

Hallam, Henry.

Constitutional history of England
from accession of Henry VII to
death of George II.

Taswell-Langmead, Thomas Pitt

English constitutional history.

Taylor, Hannis.

Origin and growth of the
English constitution.

Makower, Felix.

Constitutional history and
constitution of the Church of
England.

Sources:—

Rushworth, John.

Historical Collection of private
passages of State, Weighty Matters
in Law, Remarkable Proceedings
in Five Parliaments, Beginning
the Sixteenth Year of King James
June 1618 and ending the
fifth Year of King Charles,
June 1629. 8 vol.

Journals of the House of Commons 1640-44

Gardiner, S. R.

Constitutional documents of the
Revolution. 1628-1660

Prothors, G. W.

Statutes and constitutional
documents. 1559-1625-

Periodicals

American Church Review 1:9

Church, in 17th. century.

Church Quarterly 32:188

Church under Mary I.

Church Review 51:256

Church, Restoration of.

— — 50:16

Church, removal of Bishops of.

Churchill 21:180

Church and Puritanism

— 10:161

Church of England.

Edinburgh Review 110:329

Church, from 1660-'63

— — 115:377

Revolution of church history.

Edinburgh Review 133: 394
Church, Puritanism and Arnold's

English Historical Review 6: 351
Letters

— — — 10: 417

Condition of morals and religious
belief in reign of Edward VI

— — — 7: 369

England in 1644-45

— — — 7: 281

England in 1678

London Quarterly 33: 24

Church in 17th. Century

— — — 41: 1

Reformation in England

Nation 28: 338

Reformation in England

19th. Century 24: 764

Church and Queen Elizabeth

— — — 26: 882

Church under Henry VIII

— — — 24: 1

Elizabethan settlement

19th Century 30:456
England under Charles II

Quarterly 172:451
Church, Rituals in in.

Saturday Review 71:268
Church history of

Scotland Review 13:227
Church, Relations with Rome
under Charles.





UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA



3 0112 082194918